1				
2				
3	LISA M. POOLEY, SBN 168737 lpooley@hansonbridgett.com SAMANTHA WOLFF, SBN 240280 swolff@hansonbridgett.com RUSSELL C. PETERSEN, SBN 264245			
4				
5	russ.petersen@hansonbridgett.com CANDICE P. SHIH, SBN 294251			
6				
7	San Francisco, California 94105 Telephone: (415) 777-3200			
8				
9	HANSON BRIDGETT LLP TYSON M. SHOWER, SBN 190375			
10	tshower@hansonbridgett.com LANDON D. BAILEY, SBN 240236			
11				
12				
13	Telephone: (916) 442-3333 Facsimile: (916) 442-2348			
14				
15	VICTOR OTTEN, SBN 165800 vic@ottenlawpc.com KAVITA TEKCHANDANI, SBN 234873			
16				
17				
18				
19	Attorneys for Plaintiffs CORY SPENCER, DIANA MILENA			
20				
21				
22	UNITED STATES DIS	STRICT COURT		
23	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFO	DRNIA, WESTERN DIVISION		
24	1			
25	/ /	ASE NO. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)		
26	?    `	LAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO VIDENCE SUBMITTED IN		
27	PROTECTION RANGERS, INC., a $\overline{S}$	UPPORT OF DEFENDANTS CITY F PALOS VERDES ESTATES AND		
28		HIEF OF POLICE JEFF KEPLEY'S  Case No. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)		
	II.	Case 110. 2.10-07-02129-310 (RAUX)		

PLTFS.' OBJS. TO EVID. SUBMITTED ISO DEFTS. CITY AND KEPLEY'S REPLY TO PLTFS.' SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO THE CITY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

1	corporation,	REPLY TO PLA	
2	Plaintiffs,	THE CITY'S M	AL OPPOSITION TO OTION FOR
3	Fiamuiis,	SUMMARY JU	DGMENT
4	V.		
5	LUNADA BAY BOYS; THE		
6	INDIVIDUAL MEMBERS OF THE LUNADA BAY BOYS, including but		
7	not limited to SANG LEE, BRANT		
8	BLAKEMAN, ALAN JOHNSTON AKA JALIAN JOHNSTON,	Complaint Filed:	March 29, 2016
9	MICHAEL RAE PAPAYANS,	Complaint Filed: Trial Date:	March 29, 2016 December 12, 2017
	ANGELO FERRARA, FRANK		
10	FERRARA, CHARLIE FERRARA, and N. F.; CITY OF PALOS VERDES		
11	ESTATES; CHIEF OF POLICE JEFF		
12	KEPLEY, in his representative capacity; and DOES 1-10,		
13			
14	Defendants.		
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		-2- Ca	se No. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)

Plaintiffs Cory Spencer, Diana Milena Reed and Coastal Protection Rangers, Inc. (collectively referred to as "Plaintiffs") hereby object to the following evidence presented by Defendants City of Palos Verdes Estates and Chief of Police Jeff Kepley's In Support of Their Reply to Plaintiffs' Supplemental Opposition to the City's Motion for Summary Judgment, filed on October 27, 2017.

## I. OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF CHRISTOPHER D. GLOS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS CITY OF PALOS VERDES ESTATES AND CHIEF OF POLICE JEFF KEPLEY'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO THE CITY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Dkt. No. 502-5.)

9	Evidence:	Objections:
10	1. " the City-owned flip phone	1. The declarant (outside counsel for the
11	[was] used without City knowledge by	City of Palos Verdes) failed to lay a
12	Defendant Blakeman." (Glos Dec.,	foundation to support a finding that he
13	¶ 8.)	has personal, first-hand knowledge of
14		this asserted fact. (FRE 603.)
15		Moreover, Defendant Blakeman testified
16		during his deposition that the City
17		provided the phone to him. (Franklin
18		Dec. in Opp. to Def. City's MSJ, Ex. 3,
19		14:8-15:17 [Dkt. No. 305].)
20	2. " the City-owned cell phone	2. The declarant (outside counsel for the
21	[was] used without the City's	City of Palos Verdes) failed to lay a
22	knowledge by Mr. Blakeman." (Glos	foundation to support a finding that he
23	Dec., ¶ 12.)	has personal, first-hand knowledge of
24		this asserted fact. (FRE 603.)
25		Moreover, Defendant Blakeman testified
26		during his deposition that the City
27		provided the phone to him. (Franklin
20		ı

-3-

Case No. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Evidence:	Objections:
	Dec. in Opp. to Def. City's MSJ, Ex. 3,
	14:8-15:17 [Dkt. No. 305].)

II. OBJECTIONS TO THE DECLARATION OF TONY BEST IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS CITY OF PALOS VERDES ESTATES AND CHIEF OF POLICE JEFF KEPLEY'S REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS' SUPPLEMENTAL OPPOSITION TO THE CITY'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT (Dkt. No. 502-4.)

Evidence:	Objections:
3. "Based on my review of the	3. The declarant's statement about the
property chain-of-custody form, other	content of the chain-of-custody form is
than as may have been required for the	hearsay. (FRE 801.) The declarant also
criminal investigation and/or the	has not complied with the original
criminal prosecution, the NF phone	document rule. (FRE 1002.) The
has been maintained in a sealed	statement also is not relevant because the
evidence folder by Property and	declarant does not state whether the
Evidence." (Best Dec., ¶ 5.)	phone has or has not been removed from
	a sealed evidence folder since September
	2015, or, if it was removed from the
	sealed evidence folder, what was done
	with the phone. (FRE 401.)
	<u> </u>

22 || / / /

23 || / / /

24 || / / /

25 || / / /

26 | / / /

27 || / / /

28 | / / /

Case No. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)

1	DATED: October 31, 2017	HANSON BRIDGETT LLP
2		
3		
4		By: /s/ Lisa M. Pooley
5		KURT A. FRANKLIN LISA M. POOLEY
6		SAMANTHA D. WOLFF
7		Attorneys for Plaintiffs CORY SPENCER, DIANA MILENA
8		REED, and COASTAL PROTECTION
9		RANGERS, INC.
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		_5_ Case No. 2:16-cv-02129-SJO (RAOx)